

20



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/788,670	02/21/2001	Hartvig W.J. Ekner	12135-006001/0113.00US	6040

26171 7590 02/23/2005

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
1425 K STREET, N.W.
11TH FLOOR
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3500

EXAMINER

DO, CHAT C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2124

DATE MAILED: 02/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/788,670

Applicant(s)

EKNER ET AL

Examiner

Chat C. Do

Art Unit

2124

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 November 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13, 15-27 and 29-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13, 15-27 and 29-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/24/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to Amendment filed 11/24/2004.
2. Claims 1-13, 15-27, and 29-41 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 15, and 29 are independent claims. In Amendment, claims 14, 28, 42 are cancelled and claims 1, 15, 29 are amended. This Office action is made non-final after a RCE filed 11/24/2004.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1, 9-13, 15, 23-27, 29, and 37-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Weng et al. (U.S. 6,199,088).

Re claim 1, Weng et al. disclose in Figures 2-3 a multiply unit (abstract and all component in Figure 2) comprising: at least one input data path (e.g. paths for receiving A and B into 12 as example) for receiving one or more input operands (e.g. A and B) to the multiply unit (e.g. all components in Figure 2); an arithmetic multiplier (e.g. multiplier for multiplying $B \cdot A^{-1}$) connected to receive the one or more input operands (e.g. B); a binary polynomial multiplier (e.g. 12, 14, and half multiplier) connected to receive the one or more input operands (e.g. A and output of permutation circuit) and

including components separate and distinct from components of the arithmetic multiplier (e.g. polynomial multiplier is 12, 14, and half multiplier wherein the arithmetic multiplier is the multiplier of $B \cdot A^{-1}$), and permutation logic (e.g. permutation circuit of A^{2^M} as seen in Figure 2) connected to receive the one or more input operands (e.g. A) and operable to produce an output (e.g. output of 105 in Figure 3) comprising a permutation of the one or more input operands (e.g. A^{2^M}) and a multiply unit output data path (e.g. output of Figure 2 or 3) connected to receive an output of the arithmetic multiplier (e.g. 108) and connected to receive an output of the binary polynomial multiplier (e.g. 106) and connected to receive the output of the permutation logic (e.g. 105).

Re claim 9, Weng et al. further disclose in Figures 2-3 the binary polynomial multiplier includes a binary polynomial multiplication array (e.g. col. 6 line 20 and lines 40-57).

Re claim 10, Weng et al. further disclose in Figures 2-3 the binary polynomial multiplier includes a polynomial multiplication array having a first input and a second input (e.g. A and output of permutation circuit), the polynomial multiplication array including: a plurality of row multipliers (e.g. half multiplier) that multiply the first input by a bit of the second input; and at least one adder (e.g. col. 6 line 20) for computing a result by adding the results from the plurality of row multipliers.

Re claim 11, Weng et al. further disclose in Figures 2-3 the at least one adder performs a bit-wise exclusive-or on the results from the plurality of row multipliers (e.g. col. 5 lines 37-40).

Re claim 12, Weng et al. further disclose in Figures 2-3 at least one of the pluralities of row multipliers performs multiplication by computing a logical AND of the first input and a bit of the second input (e.g. col. 5 lines 65-67 and col. 6 lines 1-11).

Re claim 13, Weng et al. further disclose in Figures 2-3 further comprising an accumulator, and wherein the at least one adder computes a result by adding the results from the plurality of row multipliers and the accumulator (e.g. col. 5 line 66 and col. 6 line 20).

Re claim 15, it is a processor claim of claim 1. Thus, claim 15 is also rejected under the same rationale in the rejection of rejected claim 1.

Re claim 23, it is a processor claim of claim 9. Thus, claim 23 is also rejected under the same rationale in the rejection of rejected claim 9.

Re claim 24, it is a processor claim of claim 10. Thus, claim 24 is also rejected under the same rationale in the rejection of rejected claim 10.

Re claim 25, it is a processor claim of claim 11. Thus, claim 25 is also rejected under the same rationale in the rejection of rejected claim 11.

Re claim 26, it is a processor claim of claim 12. Thus, claim 26 is also rejected under the same rationale in the rejection of rejected claim 12.

Re claim 27, it is a processor claim of claim 13. Thus, claim 27 is also rejected under the same rationale in the rejection of rejected claim 13.

Re claim 29, it is a computer-readable medium claim of claim 1. Thus, claim 29 is also rejected under the same rationale in the rejection of rejected claim 1.

Re claim 37, it is a computer-readable medium claim of claim 9. Thus, claim 37 is also rejected under the same rationale in the rejection of rejected claim 9.

Re claim 38, it is a computer-readable medium claim of claim 10. Thus, claim 38 is also rejected under the same rationale in the rejection of rejected claim 10.

Re claim 39, it is a computer-readable medium claim of claim 11. Thus, claim 39 is also rejected under the same rationale in the rejection of rejected claim 11.

Re claim 40, it is a computer-readable medium claim of claim 12. Thus, claim 40 is also rejected under the same rationale in the rejection of rejected claim 12.

Re claim 41, it is a computer-readable medium claim of claim 13. Thus, claim 41 is also rejected under the same rationale in the rejection of rejected claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 2-6, 16-20, and 30-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Weng et al. (U.S. 6,199,088) in view of Bhandal et al. (U.S. 6,711,602).

Re claims 2-6, Weng et al. do not disclose in Figures 2-3 the arithmetic multiplier includes a Wallace tree multiplier array including a plurality of carry-save adders arranged in a tree structure and a carry-propagate adder wherein the multiplier utilizing Booth recoding logic. However, Bhandal et al disclose in Figures 5-8 the arithmetic

multiplier includes a Wallace tree multiplier array (e.g. all levels of CSA in Figure 7) including a plurality of carry-save adders (e.g. CSA) arranged in a tree structure (e.g. all levels of CSA arrangement) and a carry-propagate adder wherein the multiplier utilizing Booth recoding logic (e.g. 710b). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention is made to add the arithmetic multiplier includes a Wallace tree multiplier array including a plurality of carry-save adders arranged in a tree structure and a carry-propagate adder wherein the multiplier utilizing Booth recoding logic as seen in Bhandal et al.'s invention into Weng et al.'s invention because it would enable to reduce the circuitry complexity and increase the system performance.

Re claim 16 it is a processor claim of claim 2. Thus, claim 16 is also rejected under the same rationale in the rejection of rejected claim 2.

Re claim 17, it is a processor claim of claim 3. Thus, claim 17 is also rejected under the same rationale in the rejection of rejected claim 3.

Re claim 18, it is a processor claim of claim 4. Thus, claim 18 is also rejected under the same rationale in the rejection of rejected claim 4.

Re claim 19, it is a processor claim of claim 5. Thus, claim 19 is also rejected under the same rationale in the rejection of rejected claim 5.

Re claim 20, it is a processor claim of claim 6. Thus, claim 20 is also rejected under the same rationale in the rejection of rejected claim 6.

Re claim 30, it is a computer-readable medium claim of claim 2. Thus, claim 30 is also rejected under the same rationale in the rejection of rejected claim 2.

Re claim 31, it is a computer-readable medium claim of claim 3. Thus, claim 31 is also rejected under the same rationale in the rejection of rejected claim 3.

Re claim 32, it is a computer-readable medium claim of claim 4. Thus, claim 32 is also rejected under the same rationale in the rejection of rejected claim 4.

Re claim 33, it is a computer-readable medium claim of claim 5. Thus, claim 33 is also rejected under the same rationale in the rejection of rejected claim 5.

Re claim 34, it is a computer-readable medium claim of claim 6. Thus, claim 34 is also rejected under the same rationale in the rejection of rejected claim 6.

7. Claims 7-8, 21-22, and 35-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Weng et al. (U.S. 6,199,088) in view of Magar (U.S. 4,538,239).

Re claims 7, Weng et al. do not disclose in Figures 2-3 the arithmetic multiplier performs 32-bit by 16 bit multiplications in a two clock cycles. However, Magar disclose in Figure 3 that an arithmetic multiplier performs 16x16 multiplications in a two clock cycles back in 1985. As the technology improve, more multiplications can be processed in less cycles. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention is made to perform 32x16 multiplications in a two clock t cycles as seen in Magar's invention into Weng et al.'s invention because it would enable to increase the system performance.

Re claim 8, Weng et al. do not disclose in Figures 2-3 the arithmetic multiplier performs 32-bit by 32 bit multiplications in three clock cycles. However, Magar disclose in Figure 3 that an arithmetic multiplier performs 16x16 multiplications in a two clock

cycles back in 1985. As the technology improve, more multiplications can be processed in less cycles. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention is made to perform 32x32 multiplications in a three clock cycles as seen in Magar's invention into Weng et al.'s invention because it would enable to increase the system performance.

Re claim 21, it is a processor claim of claim 7. Thus, claim 21 is also rejected under the same rationale in the rejection of rejected claim 7.

Re claim 22, it is a processor claim of claim 8. Thus, claim 22 is also rejected under the same rationale in the rejection of rejected claim 8.

Re claim 35, it is a computer-readable medium claim of claim 7. Thus, claim 35 is also rejected under the same rationale in the rejection of rejected claim 7.

Re claim 36, it is a computer-readable medium claim of claim 8. Thus, claim 36 is also rejected under the same rationale in the rejection of rejected claim 8.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-13, 15-27, and 29-41 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chat C. Do whose telephone number is (571) 272-3721. The examiner can normally be reached on M => F from 7:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

Art Unit: 2124

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chaki Kakali can be reached on (571) 272-3719. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Chat C. Do
Examiner
Art Unit 2124

February 15, 2005


KAKALI CHAKI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100